arXiv:1211.2147v2 [math.NT] 12 Nov 2012

Superabundant numbers, their subsequences and the Riemann hypothesis

Sadegh Nazardonyavi* Semyon Yakubovich†

November 13, 2012

Departamento de Matemática, Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade do Porto,
4169-007 Porto, Portugal

Abstract

Let $\sigma(n)$ be the sum of divisors of a positive integer n. Robin's theorem states that the Riemann hypothesis is equivalent to the inequality $\sigma(n) < e^{\gamma} n \log\log n$ for all $n > 5040$ (γ is Euler's constant). It is a natural question in this direction to find a first integer, if exists, which violates this inequality. Following this process, we introduce a new sequence of numbers and call it as extremely abundant numbers. In this paper we show that the Riemann hypothesis is true, if and only if, there are infinitely many of these numbers. Moreover, we investigate some of their properties together with superabundant and colossally abundant numbers.

Keywords: Extremely abundant numbers, Superabundant numbers, Robin's theorem, Chebyshev's function

MSC: 11A25, 11N37, 11Y70, 11K31

1 Introduction

There are several equivalent statements to the famous Riemann hypothesis (RH) [4]. Some of them are related to the asymptotic behavior of arithmetic functions. In

---

[*] The work of the first author is supported by the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, under Ph.D. grant number CB/C02/2009/32. Research partially funded by the European Regional Development Fund through the programme COMPETE and by the Portuguese Government through the FCT under the project PEst-C/MAT/UI0144/2011., Email: sdnazdi@yahoo.com

[†] Email: syakubov@fc.up.pt

particular, the known Robin's criterion (theorem, inequality, etc.) deals with the upper bound of $\sigma(n)$. Namely,

Theorem ([24], Th. 1)**.** *The Riemann hypothesis is true, if and only if,*

$$\forall n \geq 5041, \qquad \frac{\sigma(n)}{n \log\log n} < e^{\gamma} \tag{1}$$

where $\sigma(n) = \sum_{d|n} d$ *and* γ *is Euler's constant.*

Throughout this paper, as Robin used in [24], we let

$$f(n) = \frac{\sigma(n)}{n \log\log n}. \tag{2}$$

In 1913, Gronwall [13] in his study of asymptotic maximal size for the sum of divisors of n, found that the order of $\sigma(n)$ is always "very nearly n" ([14], Th. 323), proving

Theorem. (Gronwall)

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} f(n) = e^{\gamma}. \tag{3}$$

Ramanujan in his unpublished manuscript [23] proved that if n is a generalized superior highly composite number, i.e. a number of CA which we introduce in the next section, then under the Riemann hypothesis

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \left(\frac{\sigma(n)}{n} - e^{\gamma}\log\log n\right)\sqrt{\log n} \geq -\, e^{\gamma}(2\sqrt{2} + \gamma - \log 4\pi) \approx -1.558,$$

and

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \left(\frac{\sigma(n)}{n} - e^{\gamma}\log\log n\right)\sqrt{\log n} \leq -\, e^{\gamma}(2\sqrt{2} - 4 - \gamma + \log 4\pi) \approx -1.393.$$

Later in 1984, Robin [24] showed in a similar manner that

$$f(n) \leq e^{\gamma} + \frac{0.6482\ldots}{(\log\log n)^2}\ , \qquad \forall\ n \geq 3, \tag{4}$$

where $0.6482\ldots \approx (\frac{7}{3} - e^{\gamma}\log\log 12)\log\log 12$ and the left hand side of (4) attains its maximum at $n = 12$.

In the same spirit, Lagarias [17] proved that the Riemann hypothesis is equivalent to

$$\sigma(n) \leq e^{H_n} \log H_n + H_n, \qquad (n \geq 1),$$

where $H_n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} 1/j$ and it is called the n-th harmonic number.

Investigating upper and lower bounds of arithmetic functions, Landau ([18], pp. 216-219) obtained the following limits:

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\varphi(n)\log\log n}{n} = e^{-\gamma}\ , \qquad \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\varphi(n)}{n} = 1,$$

where $\varphi(n)$ is the Euler totient function, which is defined as the number of positive integers not exceeding n that are relatively prime to n and can also be expressed as a product extended over the distinct prime divisors of n (see [3, Th. 2.4]); i.e.

$$\varphi(n) = n\prod_{p|n}\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right).$$

Furthermore, Nicolas [19] proved that, if the Riemann hypothesis is true, we have for all $k \geq 1$,

$$\frac{N_k}{\varphi(N_k)\log\log N_k} > e^{\gamma}, \tag{5}$$

where $N_k = \prod_{j=1}^{k} p_j$ and p_j is the j-th prime. On the other hand, if the Riemann hypothesis is false, then there are infinitely many k for which (5) is true, and infinitely many k for which (5) is false.

Superabundant numbers are defined ([2], see also [23]) via the following inequality:

$$\frac{\sigma(n)}{n} > \frac{\sigma(m)}{m} \qquad \text{for all } m < n. \tag{6}$$

Briggs [5] describes a computational study of the successive maxima of the relative sum-of-divisors function $\sigma(n)/n$. These maxima occurs at superabundant and colossally abundant numbers(see the next section for definition). He also studies the density of these numbers.

Another study on Robin inequality can be found in [8]. It was shown that RH holds true, if and only if, every natural number divisible by a fifth power > 1 satisfies Robin's inequality.

Akbary and Friggstad [1] established the following interesting theorem which enables us to limit out attention to a narrow sequence of positive integers to find a probable counterexample to (1).

Theorem ([1], Th. 3)**.** *If there is any counterexample to Robin's inequality, then the least such counterexample is a superabundant number.*

Unfortunately, to our knowledge, there is no known algorithm to compute superabundant number, as well as, the number of superabundant numbers less than x is more than

$$c\frac{\log x \log\log x}{(\log\log\log x)^2},$$

and later in [12] it was proved that for every $\delta < 5/48$ it exceeds

$$(\log x)^{1+\delta}, \qquad (x > x_0).$$

As a natural question in this direction, it is interesting to determine the least number, if exists, that violates inequality (1) which belongs to a thinner sequence of positive integers, and study its properties. Following this process, we introduce a new sequence of numbers, give the name *extremely abundant numbers* and will present some of their properties. As we will prove in this paper that the least number, if any, should be an extremely abundant number. Therefore we will establish another criterion, which is equivalent to the Riemann hypothesis.

Recently, Caveney et al. [6] defined a positive integer n as an extraordinary number, if n is composite and $f(n) \geq f(kn)$ for all

$$k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{1/p : \ p \text{ is a prime factor of } n\}.$$

Under these conditions, they showed that the smallest extraordinary number is $n = 4$. Then they proved that the Riemann hypothesis is true if and only if 4 is the only extraordinary number.

2 Extremely abundant numbers

Definition 1. *A positive integer n is an extremely abundant number, if either $n = 10080$ or $n > 10080$ and*

$$\forall m \quad \text{s.t.} \quad 10080 \leq m < n, \qquad \frac{\sigma(m)}{m\log\log m} < \frac{\sigma(n)}{n\log\log n}. \tag{7}$$

In Table 1 we list the first 20 extremely abundant numbers. To find them we used a list of superabundant numbers provided in [16] and [20]. Here 10080 has been chosen as the smallest superabundant number greater than 5040.

First let us call a positive integer n by (cf. [2])

(i) *highly abundant*, if $\sigma(n) > \sigma(m)$ for all $m < n$;

(ii) *colossally abundant*, if for some $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\frac{\sigma(n)}{n^{1+\varepsilon}} > \frac{\sigma(m)}{m^{1+\varepsilon}}, \qquad (m < n) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \frac{\sigma(n)}{n^{1+\varepsilon}} \geq \frac{\sigma(m)}{m^{1+\varepsilon}}, \qquad (m > n);$$

(iii) *highly composite*, if $d(n) > d(m)$ for all $m < n$, where $d(n) = \sum_{d|n} 1$;

(iv) *superior highly composite number*, if there is a positive number ε such that

$$\frac{d(n)}{n^\varepsilon} \ge \frac{d(m)}{m^\varepsilon}, \qquad (m < n) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \frac{d(n)}{n^\varepsilon} > \frac{d(m)}{m^\varepsilon}, \qquad (m > n).$$

(v) *generalized superior highly composite*, if there is a positive number ε such that

$$\frac{\sigma_{-s}(n)}{n^\varepsilon} \ge \frac{\sigma_{-s}(m)}{m^\varepsilon}, \qquad (m < n) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \frac{\sigma_{-s}(n)}{n^\varepsilon} > \frac{\sigma_{-s}(m)}{m^\varepsilon}, \qquad (m > n).$$

where $\sigma_{-s}(n) = \sum_{d|n} d^{-s}$.

The study of these classes of numbers was initiated by Ramanujan, in an unpublished part of his 1915 work on highly composite numbers ([21], [23], [22]). More precisely, he defined rather general classes of these numbers. For instance, he defined generalized highly composite numbers, containing as a subset superabundant numbers ([21], section 59). Moreover, he introduced the generalized superior highly composite numbers, including as a particular case colossally abundant numbers. Fore more details about these numbers see [2], [12] and [23].

Further, we denote the following sets of integers by

$$\begin{aligned} SA &= \{n : \ n \text{ is superabundant}\} \\ CA &= \{n : \ n \text{ is colossally abundant}\} \\ XA &= \{n : \ n \text{ is extremely abundant}\} \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $XA \neq CA$ (see Table 1). In this paper, we shall prove that infinitely many numbers of CA are not in XA and, if RH holds, that infinitely many numbers of XA are in CA. From the definition of extremely abundant numbers it follows an elementary

Proposition 1. *We have $XA \subset SA$.*

Proof. First, $10080 \in SA$. Further, if $n > 10080$ and $n \in XA$, then, for $10080 \le m < n$, we have

$$\frac{\sigma(n)}{n} = f(n) \log\log n > f(m) \log\log m = \frac{\sigma(m)}{m}.$$

In particular, for $m = 10080$, we get

$$\frac{\sigma(n)}{n} > \frac{\sigma(10080)}{10080},$$

so that, for $m < 10080$, we have

$$\frac{\sigma(n)}{n} > \frac{\sigma(10080)}{10080} > \frac{\sigma(m)}{m},$$

since $10080 \in SA$. Therefore, n belongs to SA. $\square$

Next, motivating our construction of extremely abundant numbers, we will establish the first main result of the paper.

Theorem 1. *If there is any counterexample to Robins inequality (1), then the least one is an extremely abundant number.*

Proof. By doing some computer calculations we observe, that there is no counterexample to Robin's inequality (1) for $5040 < n \leq 10080$. Now let $n > 10080$ be the least counterexample to inequality (1). For m satisfying $10080 \leq m < n$, we have

$$f(m) < e^{\gamma} \leq f(n)$$

so that n is extremely abundant. $\square$

As we mentioned in Introduction, we will prove an equivalent criterion to the Riemann hypothesis for which the proof is based on Robin's inequality (1) and Gronwall Theorem. Let $\#A$ denote the cardinal number of a set A. The second main result is

Theorem 2. *The Riemann hypothesis is true if and only if* $\#XA = \infty$.

Proof. Sufficiency. Assume that RH is not true, then according to Robin's theorem, $f(m) \geq e^{\gamma}$ for some m. From Gronwall's theorem, $M = \sup_{n \geq 10080} f(n)$ is finite and there exists n_0 such that $f(n_0) = M \geq e^{\gamma}$ (if $M = e^{\gamma}$ then set $n_0 = m$). An integer $n > n_0$ satisfies $f(n) \leq M = f(n_0)$ and n can not be in XA so that $\#XA \leq n_0$.

Necessity. On the other hand, if the RH is true, then Robin's inequality (1) is true. If $\#XA$ is finite, then there exists an m such that for every $n > m$, $f(n) \leq f(m)$. Then

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} f(n) \leq f(m) < e^{\gamma},$$

which is a contradiction to Gronwall's theorem. $\square$

There are some primes, which cannot be the largest prime factors of any extremely abundant number. For example, referring to Table 1, there is no extremely abundant number with the largest prime factor $p(n) = 149$.

3 Auxiliary Lemmas

Before we state several properties of SA, CA and XA numbers, we give the following lemmas.

Lemma 1. *Let* a, b *be positive constants and* x, y *positive variables for which*

$$\log x > a, \qquad \log\log y > 1$$

and

$$x\left(1 - \frac{a}{\log x}\right) < y < x\left(1 + \frac{b\log\log x}{\log x}\right),$$

Then

$$y\left(1 - c\frac{\log\log y}{\log y}\right) < x < y\left(1 + \frac{d}{\log y}\right),$$

where

$$c \geq b\left(1 - \frac{b\log\log x - \frac{b\log\log x}{\log x}}{\log x + b\log\log x}\right), \qquad d \geq a\left(1 + \frac{a + \frac{b\log\log x}{\log x}}{\log x - a}\right).$$

Proof. Dividing by x, inverting both sides and multiplying by y, we get

$$\frac{y}{1 + b\log\log x/\log x} < x < \frac{y}{1 - a/\log x}.$$

We are looking for constants c and d such that

$$1 - c\frac{\log\log y}{\log y} < \frac{1}{1 + b\log\log x/\log x},$$

or equivalently

$$c > \frac{\log y}{\log\log y}\frac{b\log\log x}{\log x + b\log\log x},$$

and

$$\frac{1}{1 - a/\log x} < 1 + \frac{d}{\log y},$$

or equivalently

$$d > \log y\frac{a}{\log x - a}.$$

First we determine c. Since

$$y < x\left(1 + \frac{b\log\log x}{\log x}\right),$$

then

$$\log y < \log x + \log\left(1 + \frac{b\log\log x}{\log x}\right) < \log x + \frac{b\log\log x}{\log x}.$$

The function

$$\frac{\log t}{\log\log t}$$

is increasing for $t > e^e$, thus

$$\frac{\log y}{\log\log y} < \frac{\log x + \frac{b\log\log x}{\log x}}{\log(\log x + \frac{b\log\log x}{\log x})} < \frac{\log x + \frac{b\log\log x}{\log x}}{\log\log x}.$$

So that if

$$\begin{aligned} c >& \frac{\log x + \frac{b\log\log x}{\log x}}{\log\log x}\frac{b\log\log x}{\log x + b\log\log x} \\ =& b\left(\log x + \frac{b\log\log x}{\log x}\right)\frac{1}{\log x + b\log\log x} \\ =& b\left(1 - \frac{b\log\log x - \frac{b\log\log x}{\log x}}{\log x + b\log\log x}\right), \end{aligned}$$

then

$$c > \frac{\log y}{\log\log y}\frac{b\log\log x}{\log x + b\log\log x},$$

and hence

$$x > y\left(1 - c\frac{\log\log y}{\log y}\right).$$

Similarly, if

$$\begin{aligned} d >& \left(\log x + \frac{b\log\log x}{\log x}\right)\frac{a}{\log x - a} \\ =& a\left(1 + \frac{a + \frac{b\log\log x}{\log x}}{\log x - a}\right), \end{aligned}$$

then

$$d > \log y \frac{a}{\log x - a},$$

and therefore

$$x < y\left(1 + \frac{d}{\log y}\right).$$

□

By elementary differential calculus one can prove

Lemma 2. *Let* $h(x) = \log\log x$*. Then*

$$g(y) = \frac{yh(y) - xh(x)}{(y-x)h(x)}, \qquad (y > x > e).$$

is increasing. Especially, if $c > 1$ *and* $e < x < y < c\,x$*, we have* $g(y) < g(c\,x)$*.*

We will need in the sequel the following inequality

$$\frac{1}{c-1}\left(c\frac{\log\log cx}{\log\log x} - 1\right) < 1 + \frac{c}{c-1}\frac{\log c}{\log x \log\log x}. \tag{8}$$

Indeed, since

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{c-1}\left(c\frac{\log\log cx}{\log\log x} - 1\right) &= \frac{1}{c-1}\left(c\frac{\log\log cx - \log\log x}{\log\log x} + c - 1\right)\\ &= \frac{1}{c-1}\left(\frac{c}{\log\log x}\log\left(1 + \frac{\log c}{\log x}\right) + c - 1\right)\\ &< \frac{1}{c-1}\left(\frac{c}{\log\log x}\left(\frac{\log c}{\log x}\right) + c - 1\right)\\ &= 1 + \frac{c}{c-1}\frac{\log c}{\log x \log\log x}.\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3. *Let* $x \geq 11$*. For* $y > x$ *we have*

$$\frac{\log\log y}{\log\log x} < \frac{\sqrt{y}}{\sqrt{x}}.$$

Lemma 4 ([9], [10])**.** *We have*

$$\pi(x) > \frac{x}{\log x}\left(1 + \frac{1}{\log x}\right), \qquad (x \geq 599),$$

$$\pi(x) < \frac{x}{\log x}\left(1 + \frac{1.2762}{\log x}\right), \qquad (x > 1).$$

where $\pi(x)$ *is the number of primes* $\leq x$*.*

Recall Chebyshev's function $\psi(x)$, which is the logarithm of the least common multiple of all integers not exceeding x, namely

$$\psi(x) = \sum_{p^m \leq x} \log p = \sum_{p \leq x} \left\lfloor \frac{\log x}{\log p} \right\rfloor \log p.$$

The prime number theorem is equivalent to ([14], Th. 434; [15], Th. 3, 12)

$$\psi(x) \sim x. \tag{9}$$

Lemma 5. *For $x > 1$, we have*

(i)
$$x\left(1-\frac{1.25}{\log x}\right) < \vartheta(x) < x\left(1+\frac{0.021}{\log x}\right),$$

(ii)
$$x\left(1-\frac{0.9}{\log x}\right) < \psi(x) < x\left(1+\frac{0.5}{\log x}\right).$$

Proof. (i) We combined Corollary 2^* and Theorem 7^* ($5.6a^*$) of [27].

(ii) We appeal Corollary 2^* of [27] for $x \geq 41$ and the fact $\psi(x) \geq \vartheta(x)$ and Computation for $x < 41$. Using the inequality in Corollary of Theorem 14 [25], i.e.

$$\psi(x) - \vartheta(x) < 1.02\sqrt{x} + 3\sqrt[3]{x}$$

and (i) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(x) - x =&\psi(x) - \vartheta(x) + \vartheta(x) - x \\ <&1.02\sqrt{x} + 3\sqrt[3]{x} + \frac{0.021}{\log x} \\ =&\left(1.02\frac{\log x}{\sqrt{x}} + 3\frac{\log x}{\sqrt[3]{x^2}} + 0.021\right)\frac{x}{\log x} \\ <&\frac{1}{2}\frac{x}{\log x}, \qquad (x \geq 780).\end{aligned}$$

For $x < 780$ we use computation.

□

Lemma 6 ([10], Prop. 1.10)**.** *For $k \geq 463$,*

$$p_{k+1} \leq p_k\left(1+\frac{1}{2\log^2 p_k}\right).$$

Lemma 7 ([11], Th. 6.12)**.** *We have*

$$\prod_{p\leq x}\left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right) < e^{\gamma}(\log x)\left(1+\frac{0.2}{\log^2 x}\right), \qquad (x \geq 2973),$$

and

$$\prod_{p\leq x}\left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right) > e^{\gamma}(\log x)\left(1-\frac{0.2}{\log^2 x}\right), \qquad (x > 1).$$

4 Some properties of SA, CA and XA numbers

This section is divided to three paragraphs, where we will exhibit several properties of superabundant, colossally abundant and extremely abundant numbers, respectively. When there is no ambiguity, we simply denote by p the largest prime factor of n.

Superabundant Numbers

Proposition 2. *Let $n < n'$ be two consecutive superabundant numbers. Then*

$$\frac{n'}{n} \leq 2.$$

Proof. Let $n = 2^{k_2} \cdots p$. We compare n with $2n$. In fact

$$\frac{\sigma(2n)/(2n)}{\sigma(n)/n} = \frac{2^{k_2+2}-1}{2^{k_2+2}-2} > 1.$$

Hence, $n' \leq 2n$. □

Proposition 3 ([2], Th. 2)**.** *Let $n = 2^{k_2} \cdots q^{k_q} \cdots r^{k_r} \cdots p$ be a superabundant number, $q < r$, and*

$$\beta := \left\lfloor \frac{k_q \log q}{\log r} \right\rfloor,$$

where $\lfloor x \rfloor$ is the greatest integer less than or equal to x. Then k_r has one of the three values : $\beta - 1$, $\beta + 1$, β.

In the next theorem we give a lower bound for the exponent k_q related to the largest prime factor of n.

Theorem 3. *Let $n = 2^{k_2} \cdots q^{k_q} \cdots p$ be a superabundant number with $2 \leq q \leq p$. Then*

$$\left\lfloor \frac{\log p}{\log q} \right\rfloor \leq k_q.$$

Proof. Let $k_q = k$ and suppose that $k \leq [\log p/\log q] - 1$. Hence

$$q^{k+1} < p. \tag{10}$$

Now we compare values of $\sigma(s)/s$, taking $s = n$ and $s = m = nq^{k+1}/p$. Since $\sigma(n)/n$ is multiplicative, we restrict our attention to different factors. But n is superabundant and $m < n$. Thus

$$1 < \frac{\sigma(n)/n}{\sigma(m)/m} = \frac{q^{2k+2} - q^{k+1}}{q^{2k+2} - 1}\left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right) = \frac{1}{1 + 1/q^{k+1}}\left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right).$$

Consequently, $p < q^{k+1}$, which contradicts (10). □

Proposition 4 ([2], Th. 5)**.** *Let* $n = 2^{k_2} \cdots q^{k_q} \cdots p$ *be a superabundant number. If* $k_q = k$ *and* $q < (\log p)^\alpha$*, where* α *is a constant, then*

$$\log \frac{q^{k+1}-1}{q^{k+1}-q} > \frac{\log q}{p \log p}\left\{1 + O\left(\frac{(\log\log p)^2}{\log p \log q}\right)\right\}, \tag{11}$$

$$\log \frac{q^{k+2}-1}{q^{k+2}-q} < \frac{\log q}{p \log p}\left\{1 + O\left(\frac{(\log\log p)^2}{\log p \log q}\right)\right\}. \tag{12}$$

Corollary 1. *Let* $n = 2^{k_2} \cdots p$ *be a superabundant number. Then there exist two positive constants* c *and* c' *such that*

$$cp \log p < 2^{k_2} < c' p \log p.$$

Proof. From (11) and

$$\log \frac{q^{k+1}-1}{q^{k+1}-q} = \log\left(1 + \frac{q-1}{q^{k+1}-q}\right) < \frac{q-1}{q^{k+1}-q} \le \frac{1}{q^k}$$

there exists a $c' > 0$ such that

$$q^k < c' \frac{p \log p}{\log q}.$$

On the other hand, by (12) and

$$\log \frac{q^{k+2}-1}{q^{k+2}-q} = \log\left(1 + \frac{q-1}{q^{k+2}-q}\right) > \frac{q-1}{q^{k+2}-1} > \frac{1}{2q^{k+1}}$$

there exists a $c > 0$ such that

$$q^k > c \frac{p \log p}{\log q}.$$

Putting $q = 2$, we get the result. □

Proposition 5. *Let* $n = 2^k \cdots p$ *be a superabundant number. Then for large enough* n

$$\left\lfloor \frac{k \log 2}{\log p} \right\rfloor = 1.$$

Proof. By Corollary 1

$$\log(cp \log p) < k \log 2 < \log(c' p \log p).$$

Hence, for large enough p

$$1 < 1 + \frac{\log(c\log p)}{\log p} < \frac{k\log 2}{\log p} < 1 + \frac{\log(c'\log p)}{\log p} < 2.$$

Therefore,

$$\left\lfloor \frac{k\log 2}{\log p} \right\rfloor = 1.$$

$\square$

Proposition 6 ([2], Th. 7)**.** *If $n = 2^k \cdots p$ is a superabundant number, then*

$$p \sim \log n.$$

Proposition 7. *Let $n = 2^{k_2} \cdots q^{k_q} \cdots p$ be a superabundant number. Then*

$$\psi(p) \le \log n. \tag{13}$$

Moreover,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\psi(p)}{\log n} = 1. \tag{14}$$

Proof. In fact, by Theorem 3

$$\psi(p) = \sum_{q\le p} \left\lfloor \frac{\log p}{\log q} \right\rfloor \log q \le \sum_{q\le p} k_q \log q = \log n.$$

In order to prove (14) we appeal to (9) and Proposition 6. $\square$

Afterwards, for simplicity we use abbreviated notation SA for superabundant numbers.

Proposition 8. *For $n = 2^k \cdots p \in SA$ we have*

$$\log n > p\left(1 - \frac{0.9}{\log p}\right),$$

and for large enough $n \in SA$

$$\log n < p\left(1 + 2\frac{\log\log p}{\log p}\right).$$

Proof. The first inequality holds by (13) and Lemma 5. Concerning the second inequality we will use the estimate from the proof of Theorem 7 of [2]. Precisely, for large enough $n \in SA$, it gives

$$\log n < \pi(p)\log(2p\log p).$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned}\log n &\le \pi(p)\log(2p\log p)\\ &< \log(2p\log p)\frac{p}{\log p}\left(1+\frac{1.2762}{\log p}\right)\\ &= p\left(1+\frac{\log(2\log p)}{\log p}\right)\left(1+\frac{1.2762}{\log p}\right)\\ &< p\left(1+2\frac{\log\log p}{\log p}\right), \qquad (p \text{ is large enough}).\end{aligned}$$

□

From Lemma 1 and Proposition 8, we conclude

Corollary 2. *For large enough $n = 2^k \cdots p \in SA$, it has*

$$\log n\left(1-\frac{2\log\log\log n}{\log\log n}\right) < p < \log n\left(1+\frac{1}{\log\log n}\right).$$

In Sections 18.3 and 18.4 of [14], it was proved that

$$\frac{6}{\pi^2} < \frac{\sigma(n)\varphi(n)}{n^2} < 1,$$

and

$$\varliminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{\sigma(n)\varphi(n)}{n^2} = \frac{6}{\pi^2}, \qquad \varlimsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{\sigma(n)\varphi(n)}{n^2} = 1.$$

Proposition 9. *For $n = 2^{k_2}\cdots q^{k_q}\cdots p \in SA$, we have*

$$\frac{\sigma(n)}{n} > \{1-\varepsilon(p)\}\frac{n}{\varphi(n)},$$

where

$$\varepsilon(p) = \frac{1}{\log p}\left(1+\frac{1.5}{\log p}\right).$$

Proof. It is enough to show that

$$\prod_{q\le p}\left(1-\frac{1}{q^{k_q+1}}\right) > 1-\frac{1}{\log p}\left(1+\frac{1.5}{\log p}\right).$$

Hence, using logarithmic inequality

$$\log\left(1-\frac{1}{t}\right) > -\frac{1}{t-1}, \qquad (t>1),$$

and Theorem 3 and Lemma 4, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\log\prod_{q\le p}\left(1-\frac{1}{q^{k_q+1}}\right) &= \sum_{q\le p}\log\left(1-\frac{1}{q^{k_q+1}}\right) > -\sum_{q\le p}\frac{1}{q^{k_q+1}-1}\\ &> -\sum_{q\le p}\frac{1}{q^{\log p/\log q}-1} = -\sum_{q\le p}\frac{1}{p-1}\\ &= -\frac{\pi(p)}{p-1} > -\frac{1}{p-1}\frac{p}{\log p}\left(1+\frac{1.2762}{\log p}\right)\\ &> -\frac{1}{\log p}\left(1+\frac{1.5}{\log p}\right), \qquad (p\ge 23).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, taking the exponential of both sides and using $e^{-x} > 1-x$ we get

$$\prod_{q\le p}\left(1-\frac{1}{q^{k_q+1}}\right) > 1-\frac{1}{\log p}\left(1+\frac{1.5}{\log p}\right), \qquad (p\ge 23).$$

For $p<23$, we use computation. ☐

Proposition 10. *Let* $n = 2^k\cdots p \in SA$. *Then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\sigma(n)}{n\log\log n} = e^\gamma.$$

More precisely,

$$\frac{\sigma(n)}{n\log\log n} < e^\gamma\left(1+\frac{0.3639\ldots}{(\log\log n)^2}\right), \qquad (n\ge 3)$$

and for large enough $n\in SA$

$$\frac{\sigma(n)}{n\log\log n} > e^\gamma\left(1-\frac{2}{\log\log n}\right). \tag{15}$$

Proof. The first inequality is exactly (4), where $0.3639\ldots = (0.6482\ldots)e^{-\gamma}$.

By using Proposition 9, Lemma 7 and Corollary 2, we have for large enough n

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\sigma(n)}{n} >& \left\{1-\varepsilon(p)\right\} e^{\gamma}(\log p)\left(1-\frac{0.2}{\log^2 p}\right)\\ =& e^{\gamma}(\log p)\left\{1-\frac{1}{\log p}\left(1+\frac{1.5}{\log p}\right)\right\}\left(1-\frac{0.2}{\log^2 p}\right)\\ >& e^{\gamma}(\log\log n)\left(1-\frac{2}{\log\log n}\right).\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 1. *It is possible to get better asymptotic result for (15) using the estimates in page 453 (combination of Theorems 4, 5) of [2].*

Theorem 4. *Let*

$$g(n) = \sigma(n) - n\log\log n.$$

Then g is increasing for large enough $n \in SA$.

Proof. Let n, n' be two consecutive superabundant numbers. By Lemma 2, Proposition 2 and inequality (8), with $c = 2$, $x = n$, $y = n'$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{n'/n-1}\left(\frac{n'}{n}\frac{\log\log n'}{\log\log n}-1\right) \leq& 2\,\frac{\log\log(2n)}{\log\log n}-1\\ <& 1+2\frac{\log 2}{\log n\log\log n}\\ <& \frac{\log\log 12}{\log\log 6}, \qquad (n \geq 24).\end{aligned}$$

This gives

$$\frac{n'}{n}-1 > \frac{\log\log 6}{\log\log 12}\left(\frac{n'}{n}\frac{\log\log n'}{\log\log n}-1\right). \tag{16}$$

By definition of SA numbers

$$\frac{\sigma(n')}{\sigma(n)} > \frac{n'}{n}.$$

Hence, via (16) we derive

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\sigma(n')}{\sigma(n)}-1 >& \frac{n'}{n}-1\\ =& \frac{\log\log 6}{\log\log 12}\frac{n'\log\log n'}{n\log\log n}-\frac{\log\log 6}{\log\log 12}\frac{n'\log\log n'}{n\log\log n}+\frac{n'}{n}-1\\ >& \frac{\log\log 6}{\log\log 12}\left(\frac{n'\log\log n'}{n\log\log n}-1\right).\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

On the other hand since $\frac{\log\log 12}{\log\log 6} < 1.56077 < e^{\gamma}$, by Proposition 10, for large enough n

$$\sigma(n) > \frac{\log\log 12}{\log\log 6}(n\log\log n). \tag{18}$$

Multiplying both sides of (17) and (18), we have

$$\sigma(n') - \sigma(n) > n'\log\log n' - n\log\log n.$$

Therefore,

$$\sigma(n') - n'\log\log n' > \sigma(n) - n\log\log n.$$

□

Proposition 11. *Let*

$$g(n) = \frac{\sigma(n)^{\sigma(n)}}{(n\log\log n)^{n\log\log n}}.$$

Then g is increasing for large enough $n \in SA$.

Proof. By Proposition 10 we have for large enough $n \in SA$

$$\sigma(n) > \frac{3}{2}n\log\log n. \tag{19}$$

We show that for two consecutive superabundant n, n'

$$\frac{\sigma(n')^{\sigma(n')}}{(n'\log\log n')^{n'\log\log n'}} > \frac{\sigma(n)^{\sigma(n)}}{(n\log\log n)^{n\log\log n}}.$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\sigma(n')^{\sigma(n')}}{\sigma(n)^{\sigma(n)}}\frac{(n\log\log n)^{n\log\log n}}{(n'\log\log n')^{n'\log\log n'}} &= \left(\frac{\sigma(n')}{\sigma(n)}\right)^{\sigma(n')}\left(\frac{n\log\log n}{n'\log\log n'}\right)^{n'\log\log n'} \\ &\quad \times \left\{\frac{\sigma(n)^{\sigma(n')-\sigma(n)}}{(n\log\log n)^{n'\log\log n'-n\log\log n}}\right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

By Theorem 4, the term inside {} is greater than 1. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{\sigma(n')}{\sigma(n)}\right)^{\sigma(n')}\left(\frac{n\log\log n}{n'\log\log n'}\right)^{n'\log\log n'} &> \left(\frac{n'}{n}\right)^{\sigma(n')}\left(\frac{n\log\log n}{n'\log\log n'}\right)^{n'\log\log n'} \\ &= \left(\frac{n'}{n}\right)^{\sigma(n')-n'\log\log n'}\left(\frac{\log\log n}{\log\log n'}\right)^{n'\log\log n'}.\end{aligned}$$

However, due to (19) the right-hand side of the equality is greater than

$$\left(\frac{n'}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}n'\log\log n'}\left(\frac{\log\log n}{\log\log n'}\right)^{n'\log\log n'}. \tag{21}$$

Finally appealing to Lemma 3 we conclude that (21) is > 1. □

Colossally Abundant Numbers It was proved by Robin ([24], Proposition 1) that the maximum order of the function f defined by (2) is attained in a colossally abundant number.

Theorem ([24], Prop. 1)**.** *If* $3 \le N \le n \le N'$, *where* N *and* N' *are two successive colossally abundant numbers, then*

$$f(n) \le \max\{f(N), f(N')\}.$$

This fact shows, that if there is a counterexample to (1), then there exists at list one colossally abundant number which violates this inequality.

Corollary 3. *Let* N *and* N' *be two consecutive CA numbers. If there exists an XA number* n *satisfying* $N < n < N'$, *then* N' *is also an XA.*

Proof. Let $N < N'$ be two consecutive CA number, and

$$X = \{m \in XA : \ N < m < N'\}, \qquad n = \max X.$$

Since $n \in XA$ and $n > N$, then $f(n) > f(N)$. From the previous theorem we must have $f(n) < f(N')$. Hence $N' \in XA$. □

Theorem 5. *If RH holds, then there exist infinitely many CA numbers that are also XA.*

Proof. If RH holds, then $\#XA = \infty$. Let $n \in XA$. If $n \in CA$, we are done. If not, there exist two successive colossally abundant numbers N, N' such that $N < n < N'$. By corollary above $N' \in XA$. Hence, under RH $\#(XA \bigcap CA) = \infty$. □

For $\varepsilon > 0$, we define $x = x_1$ and

$$F(x,1) = \frac{\log(1 + 1/x)}{\log x} = \varepsilon, \qquad F(x_k, k) = \frac{\log(1 + 1/(x_k + \cdots + x_k^k))}{\log x} = \varepsilon.$$

Let

$$N_\varepsilon = \prod_{p=2}^{x} p^{\alpha_p(\varepsilon)}, \tag{22}$$

where, either

$$\alpha_p(\varepsilon) = \lfloor \frac{\log \frac{p^{1+\varepsilon}-1}{p^{\varepsilon}-1}}{\log p} \rfloor - 1 \qquad \text{or} \qquad \alpha_p(\varepsilon) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} k, & x_{k+1} < p < x_k \\ 0, & p > x = x_1. \end{array} \right.$$

Then (22) is a standard representation of a colossally abundant number.

It can be seen that there exist infinitely many CA numbers N for which the largest prime factor p is greater than $\log N$. For this purpose, first we give the following lemmas.

Lemma 8 ([24], p. 190)**.** *We have*

(i) $x_k > x^{1/k}, \qquad (x > 1,\ k \geq 2),$

(ii) $x_2 < \sqrt{2x}, \qquad (x > 1),$

(iii) $x_2 > \sqrt{2x}\left(1 - \dfrac{\log 2}{2 \log x}\right), \qquad (x \geq 1530).$

Lemma 9 ([7], Lemma 1)**.** *Let N be a colossally abundant number. Then*

$$x_k < (kx)^{1/k}, \qquad (k \geq 2).$$

Littlewood oscillation for Chebyshev ψ function is given by

Lemma 10 ([15], Th. 34)**.** *We have*

$$\psi(x) - x = \Omega_{\pm}(x^{1/2} \log\log\log x), \qquad \text{as} \quad x \to \infty.$$

More precisely,

$$\overline{\lim_{x\to\infty}} \frac{\psi(x) - x}{x^{1/2} \log\log\log x} \geq \frac{1}{2}, \qquad \underline{\lim_{x\to\infty}} \frac{\psi(x) - x}{x^{1/2} \log\log\log x} \leq -\frac{1}{2}.$$

Theorem 6. *There are infinitely many CA numbers N_ε, such that* $\log N_\varepsilon < p(N_\varepsilon)$.

Proof. Let N_ε be a colossally abundant number defined as above. Then by Lemmas 8, 9 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log N_\varepsilon &= \sum_{2<q\leq x} \alpha_q(\varepsilon) \log q = \sum_{x_2<p\leq x} \log q + \sum_{x_3<q\leq x_2} 2\log q + \sum_{x_4<q\leq x_3} 3\log q \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{x_{m+1}<q\leq x_m \\ m\geq 4}} \alpha_q(\varepsilon) \log q \\ &\leq \sum_{x^{1/2}<q\leq x} \log q + \sum_{x^{1/3}<q\leq (2x)^{1/2}} 2\log q + \sum_{x^{1/4}<q\leq (3x)^{1/3}} 3\log q \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{x^{1/(m+1)}<q\leq (mx)^{1/m} \\ m\geq 4}} \alpha_q(\varepsilon) \log q. \end{aligned}$$

From the definition of ψ function

$$\psi(x) = \sum_{q^m \le x} \log q = \sum_{x^{1/2}<q\le x} \log q + \sum_{x^{1/3}<q\le x^{1/2}} 2\log q + \sum_{x^{1/4}<q\le x^{1/3}} 3\log q + \sum_{\substack{x^{1/(m+1)}<q\le x^{1/m} \\ m\ge 4}} m\log q.$$

Hence, by Lemma 4, 5

$$\begin{aligned}\log N_\varepsilon - \psi(x) \le& \sum_{x^{1/2}<q<(2x)^{1/2}} 2\log q + K\vartheta((3x)^{1/3}), \qquad \text{(for some } K>0)\\ \le& \sum_{x^{1/2}<q<(2x)^{1/2}} \log 2x + K\vartheta((3x)^{1/3})\\ =&\{\pi((2x)^{1/2}) - \pi(x^{1/2})\}\log 2x + K\vartheta((3x)^{1/3})\\ <& \left\{2\sqrt{2} - 2 + \frac{2^2\sqrt{2}(1.2762)}{\log 2x} - \frac{2^2}{\log x}\right\}\sqrt{x}\\ &+ K\left\{(3x)^{1/3}\left(1 + \frac{0.021}{\log(3x)^{1/3}}\right)\right\}\\ \le& c\sqrt{x}, \qquad \text{(for some } c>0).\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 10 for any x_0, there exists an $x > x_0$ such that

$$\psi(x) - x < -c'\sqrt{x}\log\log\log x, \qquad (c'>0).$$

Hence, for any x_0, there exists an $x > x_0$ such that

$$\log N_\varepsilon - x < \{c - c'\log\log\log x\}\sqrt{x} < 0.$$

Putting $p(N_\varepsilon) = x$, we get the desired result. ☐

Extremely Abundant Numbers Returning to our goal, we present some properties of XA numbers.

Theorem 7. *Let $n = 2^{k_2}\cdots p$ be an extremely abundant number. Then*

$$p < \log n.$$

Proof. For $n = 10080$ we have

$$p(10080) = 7 < 9.218 < \log(10080).$$

Let $n > 10080$ be an extremely abundant number and $m = n/p$. Then $m > 10080$, since the only superabundant numbers between 10080 and 11×10080 are $\{10080,\ 15120,\ 25200,\ 27720,\ 55440,\ 110880\}$ and by checking by computation non of them are in XA. Hence by definition

$$\frac{\sigma(n)/n}{\sigma(m)/m} > \frac{\log\log n}{\log\log m}.$$

So

$$1 + \frac{1}{p} > \frac{\log\log n}{\log\log m} \Rightarrow \frac{1}{p} > \frac{\log(1 + \log p/\log m)}{\log\log m}.$$

Using the elementary inequality

$$\frac{t}{1+t} \leq \log(1+t)\ , \qquad (t > -1), \tag{23}$$

we have

$$\frac{1}{p} > \frac{\log p}{\log n \log\log m} > \frac{\log p}{\log n \log\log n} \Rightarrow p < \log n.$$

□

We mention a similar result by

Proposition 12 ([8], Lemma 6.1)**.** *Let $t \geq 2$ be fixed. Suppose that there exists a t-free integer exceeding 5040 that does not satisfy Robin's inequality. Let $n = 2^{k_2} \cdots p$ be the smallest such integer. Then $p < \log n$.*

Theorems 6 and 7 imply

Theorem 8. *There exist infinitely many CA numbers that are not XA.*

Theorem 9. *Let*

$$g(n) = \frac{\sigma(n) + \varphi(n)}{n}.$$

For two consecutive extremely abundant numbers $n = 2^k \cdots p$ and $n' = 2^{k'} \cdots p'$, if $p' \geq p$ and $\log(n'/n) > 1/\log p$, then $g(n) < g(n')$ for large enough $n,\ n' \in XA$.

Proof. If the largest primes of n and n' are equal, it is clear. Let $p' = p_{k+1} > p_k = p$. By the proof of Theorem 7 of [2] for superabundant numbers, we have

$$\log n < \pi(p_k)\log(2p_k \log p_k), \qquad (n \geq N_0).$$

If $n > 10080$ is extremely abundant, then

$$\frac{\sigma(n)}{n\log\log n} > \frac{\sigma(10080)}{10080\log\log 10080} > 1.75.$$

Using inequality (23), Proposition 8, Lemma 7 and Lemma 6, we deduce for large enough n

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\sigma(n')}{n'}+\frac{\varphi(n')}{n'}-\frac{\sigma(n)}{n}-\frac{\varphi(n)}{n}\\
&>\frac{\sigma(n)}{n}\frac{\log\log n'-\log\log n}{\log\log n}-\frac{1}{p_{k+1}}\prod_{j=1}^{k}\left(1-\frac{1}{p_j}\right)\\
&>1.75\log\frac{\log n'}{\log n}-\frac{1}{p_{k+1}}\prod_{j=1}^{k}\left(1-\frac{1}{p_j}\right)\\
&>1.75\frac{\log(n'/n)}{\log n'}-\frac{1}{p_{k+1}}\prod_{j=1}^{k}\left(1-\frac{1}{p_j}\right)\\
&>1.75\frac{\log(n'/n)}{\log n'}-\frac{1}{p_{k+1}}\frac{e^{-\gamma}}{\log p_k}\left(1+\frac{0.2}{\log^2 p_k}\right)\\
&>1.75\frac{\log(n'/n)}{p_{k+1}(1+2\frac{\log\log p_{k+1}}{\log p_{k+1}})}-\frac{1}{p_{k+1}}\frac{e^{-\gamma}}{\log p_k}\left(1+\frac{0.2}{\log^2 p_k}\right)\\
&>\frac{1}{p_{k+1}\log p_k}\left\{\frac{1.75}{(1+2\frac{\log\log p_{k+1}}{\log p_{k+1}})}-e^{-\gamma}\left(1+\frac{0.2}{\log^2 p_k}\right)\right\}\\
&>0.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 2. *We checked that the assumptions in Theorem 9 hold up to 8150-th element of XA.*

5 Numerical experiments

In this section we give some numerical results for the set of extremely abundant numbers up to its 13770-th element, which we call it C_1 and it is less than 500,000-th superabundant number, basing on the list provided by T. D. Noe [20]. We examined the statements below for the corresponding extremely abundant numbers extracted from the list.

Property 1. *Let* $n = 2^{k_2}\cdots q^{k_q}\cdots r^{k_r}\cdots p$ *be an extremely abundant number, where* $2 \le q < r \le p$. *Then for* $10080 < n \le C_1$

(i) $\log n < q^{k_q+1}$,

(ii) $r^{k_r} < q^{k_q+1} < r^{k_r+2}$,

(iii) $q^{k_q} < k_q p$,

(iv) $q^{k_q}\log q < \log n \log\log n < q^{k_q+2}$.

Property 2. *Let* $n = 2^{k_2}\cdots x_k^{k}\cdots p$ *be an extremely abundant number, where* $2 < x_k < p$ *is the greatest prime factor of exponent* k. *Then*

$$\sqrt{p} < x_2 < \sqrt{2p}, \qquad \textit{for} \ \ 10080 < n \le C_1.$$

Property 3. *Let* $n = 2^{\alpha_2}\cdots q^{\alpha_q}\cdots p$ *and* $n' = 2^{\beta_2}\cdots q^{\beta_q}\cdots p'$ *be two consecutive extremely abundant numbers greater than* 10080. *Then for* $10080 < n \le C_1$

$$\alpha_q - \beta_q \in \{-1, 0, 1\}, \qquad \textit{for all} \ \ 2 \le q \le p'.$$

Property 4. *If* m, n *are extremely abundant and* $m < n$, *then for* $10080 < n \le C_1$

(i) $p(m) \le p(n)$,

(ii) $d(m) \le d(n)$.

Remark 3. *We note that Property 4 is not true for superabundant numbers. For example*

$$s_{47} = (19\sharp)(3\sharp)^2 2, \qquad s_{48} = (17\sharp)(5\sharp)(3\sharp)2^3, \qquad p(s_{48}) = 17 < 19 = p(s_{47}).$$

and

$$s_{173} = (59\sharp)(7\sharp)(5\sharp)(3\sharp)^2 2^3, \qquad s_{174} = (61\sharp)(7\sharp)(3\sharp)^2 2^2, \qquad \frac{d(s_{174})}{d(s_{173})} = \frac{35}{36} < 1,$$

where s_k *denotes* k*-th superabundant number.*

	n	Type	$f(n)$	$p(n)$	$\log n$	k_2
1	$(7\sharp)(3\sharp)2^3 = 10080$	s	1.75581	7	9.21831	5
2	$(113\sharp)(13\sharp)(5\sharp)(3\sharp)^2 2^3$	c	1.75718	113	126.444	8
3	$(127\sharp)(13\sharp)(5\sharp)(3\sharp)^2 2^3$	c	1.75737	127	131.288	8
4	$(131\sharp)(13\sharp)(5\sharp)(3\sharp)^2 2^3$	c	1.75764	131	136.163	8
5	$(137\sharp)(13\sharp)(5\sharp)(3\sharp)^2 2^3$	c	1.75778	137	141.083	8
6	$(139\sharp)(13\sharp)(5\sharp)(3\sharp)^2 2^3$	c	1.75821	139	146.018	8
7	$(139\sharp)(13\sharp)(5\sharp)(3\sharp)^2 2^4$	c	1.75826	139	146.711	9
8	$(151\sharp)(13\sharp)(5\sharp)(3\sharp)^2 2^3$	s	1.75831	151	156.039	8
9	$(151\sharp)(13\sharp)(5\sharp)(3\sharp)^2 2^4$	c	1.75849	151	156.732	9
10	$(151\sharp)(13\sharp)(7\sharp)(3\sharp)^2 2^4$	c	1.75860	151	158.678	9

Table 1: First 10 extremely abundant numbers (s is superabundant, c is colossally abundant and $p_k\sharp = \prod_{j=1}^{k} p_j$).

The following properties has been checked up to C_2 (250,000-th element of SA numbers) and for 8150-th element of XA numbers in this domain. Some of the functions below are taken from [26].

Property 5. *If* $n,\ n' \in SA$ *are consecutive, then*

$$\frac{\sigma(n')/n'}{\sigma(n)/n} < 1 + \frac{1}{p'}, \qquad (n' < C_2).$$

Property 6. *The composition*

$$\sigma\left(n \left\lfloor \frac{\sigma(n)}{n} \right\rfloor\right)$$

is increasing for $n \in SA$*, where* $n < C_2$*.*

Property 7. *If* $n,\ n' \in XA$ *are consecutive, then*

$$\frac{n'}{n} > 1 + c\,\frac{(\log\log n)^2}{\log n}, \qquad (0 < c \le 4,\ n' < C_2),$$

$$\frac{n'}{n} > 1 + c\,\frac{(\log\log n)^2}{\sqrt{\log n}}, \qquad (0 < c \le 0.195,\ n' < C_2).$$

Property 8. *If $n, n' \in XA$ are consecutive, then*

$$\frac{f(n')}{f(n)} < 1 + \frac{1}{p'}, \qquad (n' < C_2).$$

The number of distinct prime factors of a number n is denoted by $\omega(n)$. From Property 7 we easily can get

$$g(n) = \frac{n}{\omega(n)}$$

is increasing for $n \in XA$, where $n < C_2$.

Let $\Psi(n)$ denote Dedekind's arithmetical function of n which is defined by

$$\Psi(n) = n \prod_{p|n} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right), \qquad \Psi(1) = 1,$$

where the product is taken over all primes p dividing n.

Property 9. *The compositions*

$$(1)\ \varphi\left(n\left\lfloor\frac{\sigma(n)}{n}\right\rfloor\right), \qquad (2)\ \varphi\left(n\left\lfloor\frac{n}{\varphi(n)}\right\rfloor\right), \qquad (3)\ \varphi\left(n\left\lfloor\frac{\Psi(n)}{n}\right\rfloor\right)$$

are increasing for $n \in XA$, where $n < C_2$.

Acknowledgments

The work of the second author is supported by Center of Mathematics of the University of Porto. We thank J. C. Lagarias, C. Calderon, J. Stopple, and M. Wolf for useful discussions and sending us some relevant references. Our sincere thanks to J. L. Nicolas for useful comments and suggestions which rather improved the presentation of the paper.

References

[1] A. Akbary, Z. Friggstad, Superabundant numbers and the Riemann hypothesis, Amer. Math. Monthly 116 (3) (2009) 273-275.

[2] L. Alaoglu and P. Erdős, On highly composite and similar numbers, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 56 (1944) 448-469.

[3] Tom M. Apostol, Introduction to analytic number theory. Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1976.

[4] P. Borwein, et al, The Riemann Hypothesis: A Resource For The Afficionado And Virtuoso Alike, Springe Science+Business Media, (2008).

[5] K. Briggs, Abundant numbers and the Riemann hypothesis, Experiment. Math. 15 (2006), no. 2, 251-256.

[6] G. Caveney, J-L. Nicolas, J. Sondow, Robin's theorem, primes, and a new elementary reformulation and the Riemann hypothesis, Integers 11 (6) (2011) 753-763.

[7] G. Caveney, J-L. Nicolas, J. Sondow, On SA, CA, and GA numbers, `http://arxiv.org/abs/1112.6010`

[8] Y. Choie, N. Lichiardopol, P. Moree, P. Solé, On Robin's criterion for the Riemann hypothesis. J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux 19 (2) (2007), 357-372.

[9] P. Dusart, The k-th prime is greater than $k(\ln k + \ln\ln k - 1)$ for $k \geq 2$. Math. Comp. 68 (1999), no. 225, 411-415.

[10] P. Dusart, Autour de la fonction qui compte le nombre de nombres premiers, Thèse de Doctorat de l'Université de Limoges (1998), `http://www.unilim.fr/laco/theses/1998/T1998_01.pdf`

[11] P. Dusart, Estimates of Some Functions Over Primes without R.H. arXiv:1002.0442.

[12] P. Erdős, J-L. Nicolas, Répartition Des Nombres Superabondants, Bull. Soc. Math. France, 103 (1975) 65-90.

[13] T. H. Gronwall, Some asymptotic expressions in the theory of numbers, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., Vol. 14 (1) (Jan. 1913) 113-122.

[14] G. H. Hardy and E. M. Wright, An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers, 6th ed., Oxford University Press, Oxford (2008).

[15] Ingham, A. E. The distribution of prime numbers, With a foreword by R. C. Vaughan. Cambridge Mathematical Library. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.

[16] D. Kilminster, Table of n, a(n) for n=0..2000, `http://oeis.org/A004394/b004394.txt`.

[17] J. C. Lagarias, An Elementary Problem Equivalent to the Riemann Hypothesis, The Amer. Math. Monthly, Vol. 109 (6) (Jun. - Jul., 2002) 534-543.

[18] E. Landau, Handbuch der Lehre von der Verteilung der Primzahlen, Leipzig, Berlin: B. G. Teubner (1909).

[19] J-L. Nicolas, Petites valeurs de la fonction d'Euler, J. Number Theory 17 (3) (1983) 375-388.

[20] T. D. Noe, First 1000000 superabundant numbers, `http://oeis.org/A004394`.

[21] S. Ramanujan, Highly composite numbers, Proc. London Math. Soc. 14 (1915) 347-407.

[22] S. Ramanujan, Collected Papers, Chelsea, New York, (1962) pp. 78-129, notes pp. 338-339.

[23] S. Ramanujan, Annotated By J-L Nicolas, G. Robin, Highly Composite Numbers, The Ramanujan Journal 1 (1997) 119-153.

[24] G. Robin, Grandes valeurs de la fonction somme de diviseurs et hypothèse de Riemann, J. Math. Pure Appl. 63 (1984) 187-213.

[25] J. B. Rosser, L. Schoenfeld, Approximate Formulas for Some Functions of Prime Numbers, Illinois Journal Math. 6 (1962) 64-94.

[26] J. Sándor, S. D. Mitrinović, B. Crstici, Handbook of number theory. I. Second printing of the 1996 original. Springer, Dordrecht, 2006.

[27] L. Schoenfeld, Sharper bounds for the Chebyshev functions $\vartheta(x)$ and $\psi(x)$. II. Math. Comp. 30 (1976), no. 134, 337-360.